

## XXXVII CONGRESS—Third Session.

SENATE....WASHINGTON, Feb. 7, 1863.

A communication was received from the Secretary of the Interior asking for an increased appropriation of \$2,000 for land offices in Kansas.

Mr. LANE (Rep., Kan.) presented a memorial from the Legislature of that State for an appropriation for land surveys.

The House Bill to promote the efficiency of the Commissary Department was taken up and passed.

A message from the President was received, in answer to the resolution of the Senate transmitting a dispatch dated October 27 last, from our Minister to China, relating to the death of Gen. Ward.

Mr. COWAN (Rep., Ind.) presented a memorial from W. Cornell Jewett, for the admission of Colorado into the Union as a State.

Mr. HARRIS (Rep., N. Y.) presented a memorial from the merchant importers of New-York, praying that legal tender notes may be used for paying customs.

Mr. COWAN introduced a bill for the construction of a military and postal railroad from Washington to New-York. Referred.

## THE ARMY OF THE POTOMAC.

Mr. SUMNER (Rep., Mass.) offered the following:

*Resolved*, That the Committee on the Conduct of the War be directed to inquire into the condition of the Army of the Potomac, both officers and men, and to consider measures for its improvement, to increase its efficiency, insure the moral confidence of the officers and men, and to secure an unwavering and undivided devotion to the declared policy of the Government, with power to send for persons and papers.

Laid over.

## EMANCIPATION IN MISSOURI.

The bill for Emancipation in Missouri was taken up.

Mr. WILSON (Un., Mo.) moved to strike out "twenty million" and insert "twenty-five millions" in the appropriation.

Rejected.—Yea, 2; Nays, 26.

Mr. WILSON (Mo.) offered an amendment extending the time of the emancipation for three years.

Mr. CARLILE (Un., Va.) hoped the amendment would prevail that the people of that State might have time to exercise civil rights in those portions where they were free from guerrillas and Rebels. It was found impossible to exercise suffrage. He alluded to Gen. McNeil's execution of guerrillas.

Mr. HENDERSON (Un., Mo.) said he had been told by Gen. McNeil that the guerrillas he executed were paroled prisoners with arms in their hands, and were therefore liable to be shot.

Mr. CARLILE thought the facts in the case would be brought to the country. But he was anxious that a full vote should be had on this question and more time allowed for it than twelve months. Such had been the military terror that in Virginia not one man in three had voted on the boundary bill proposing a division of the State.

Mr. WILSON (Un., Va.) replied that by military influence thousands had voted, and he doubted if there was an authentic record in which a man was deprived of suffrage. His colleague did injustice to the Missouri bill by such a statement.

Mr. C. R. CRADLEBROUGH, if he did not know the exact vote, was polled in the Presidential election and had 19,162 for the State election.

Mr. HILLEY said that in the other election North-Western Virginia had some eight or twelve thousand voters in the field, who did not vote. Some had been killed and others had fled.

Mr. C. R. CRADLEBROUGH, if he did not know the exact vote, was polled in the Presidential election and had 19,162 for the State election.

Mr. HILLEY said that in the other election North-Western Virginia had some eight or twelve thousand voters in the field, who did not vote. Some had been killed and others had fled.

Mr. POWELL (Dem., Ky.) contended that the last election was carried by the bayonet, and a full, free vote could not be had now in the State.

Mr. WILSON (Un., Mo.) argued at some length, favored his amendment. Twelve months was too soon for shortening Secession. Missouri and entailing on the people of that State what would follow.

He desired a vote of the people of the State on this important point, with time enough to consider it. He tried to precipitate facts to show that the large majority of the members of the Convention which kept Missouri in the Union were slaveholders.

The amendment was rejected by a vote of 8 to 27.

Mr. DAVIS (Dem., Ky.) argued at great length against the bill. He said at the interview of the Border-Sate Senators and Members of Congress with the President, the latter, on explaining like Emancipation, etc., did not pretend that it was unconstitutional or impracticable, but he urged it as an amendment to the Constitution to embrace it.

Mr. THOMPSON (Dem., Ky.) said that the formation of all countries under one government would secure the balance of power, and go away with all those intricate foreign relations about which there had been so much difficulty. But it had been so ordered that the interest of the whole was best promoted by promoting the interests of individuals. He then proceeded to say that geographical divisions, though they might be imaginary, were just, whether and indispensable as any other line, as that between Canada and the United States. Such were the lines which separate the reserved rights of the States from the General Government which extend with the States after the Union was formed. The Union did not make the States, but the Union made the Union, and had once been out of it. After discussion of the reserved rights of the States and their mutual relations with the Federal Government, Mr. Thompson concluded that the voice of the Union was not greater than the rights of the States, or the rights of the people. He proceeded to say that this bill was a direct attack on the strength of the government, and on the rights of Missouri for \$10,000,000 in cash, or \$20,000,000 in credit. He requested to hear Mr. Senator from Missouri (Henderson) defend the bill on the ground that the fidelity of the State depended on it, and that he did not want at the right moment in case of its defeat, that he feared it. He (Mr. Thompson) did not believe that any legislation was necessary to help the State of Missouri. It seemed that the policy of the Administration placed itself in a position to let the Southern states go to political independence. It had a great court of its friends, England, France, Ireland, Germany, and other great powers were to be enlisted. Garrison, Greeley, and the South and others of the same stamp were to be enlisted. The Administration had lost the confidence of the people of the South and the South. He had been in touch with the leading men of the New-England school. It was a wise Union measure for the safety of the public welfare to be (Mr. Thompson) not to let it stand. At that moment in time he was not for it. Inasmuch as the Government was asked only to lend its credit, and the tolls of the Illinois and Michigan Canal were paid more than the interest on the sum expended by taxes on the work.

Mr. A. CONKLING (Rep., N. Y.) explained that the report of the Committee on Naval Affairs, which had been introduced, was made public to increase the influence of the House to improve the naval and military aspects of the work. In the committee room the Committee on Colonization was represented. There was no objection to this bill.

Nevertheless, owing to what had been said against the measure, he proposed to show how, as early as 1776, the question which agitated or connecting the waters of the Gulf of St. Lawrence with those which flow into the Gulf of Mexico, never to afford a great deal of difficulty to connect the two of the nations of large.

Referring to the report of the Committee on Naval Affairs, he said the author of Mr. F. A. Conkling, whom he would suppose, had lived on a line of salt water, which had during the last year made \$6,000,000 on a capital stock of \$100,000,000, drawn from the public treasury of the nation on account of the bill.

In further advance of the measure, he said the Government was asked only to lend its credit, and the tolls of the Illinois and Michigan Canal were paid more than the interest on the sum expended by taxes on the work.

Mr. A. CONKLING (Rep., N. Y.) explained that the report of the Committee on Naval Affairs, which had been introduced, was made public to increase the influence of the House to improve the naval and military aspects of the work. In the committee room the Committee on Colonization was represented. There was no objection to this bill.

Nevertheless, owing to what had been said against the measure, he proposed to show how, as early as 1776, the question which agitated or connecting the waters of the Gulf of St. Lawrence with those which flow into the Gulf of Mexico, never to afford a great deal of difficulty to connect the two of the nations of large.

Referring to the report of the Committee on Naval Affairs, he said the author of Mr. F. A. Conkling, whom he would suppose, had lived on a line of salt water, which had during the last year made \$6,000,000 on a capital stock of \$100,000,000, drawn from the public treasury of the nation on account of the bill.

In further advance of the measure, he said the Government was asked only to lend its credit, and the tolls of the Illinois and Michigan Canal were paid more than the interest on the sum expended by taxes on the work.

Mr. A. CONKLING (Rep., N. Y.) explained that the report of the Committee on Naval Affairs, which had been introduced, was made public to increase the influence of the House to improve the naval and military aspects of the work. In the committee room the Committee on Colonization was represented. There was no objection to this bill.

Nevertheless, owing to what had been said against the measure, he proposed to show how, as early as 1776, the question which agitated or connecting the waters of the Gulf of St. Lawrence with those which flow into the Gulf of Mexico, never to afford a great deal of difficulty to connect the two of the nations of large.

Referring to the report of the Committee on Naval Affairs, he said the author of Mr. F. A. Conkling, whom he would suppose, had lived on a line of salt water, which had during the last year made \$6,000,000 on a capital stock of \$100,000,000, drawn from the public treasury of the nation on account of the bill.

In further advance of the measure, he said the Government was asked only to lend its credit, and the tolls of the Illinois and Michigan Canal were paid more than the interest on the sum expended by taxes on the work.

Mr. A. CONKLING (Rep., N. Y.) explained that the report of the Committee on Naval Affairs, which had been introduced, was made public to increase the influence of the House to improve the naval and military aspects of the work. In the committee room the Committee on Colonization was represented. There was no objection to this bill.

Nevertheless, owing to what had been said against the measure, he proposed to show how, as early as 1776, the question which agitated or connecting the waters of the Gulf of St. Lawrence with those which flow into the Gulf of Mexico, never to afford a great deal of difficulty to connect the two of the nations of large.

Referring to the report of the Committee on Naval Affairs, he said the author of Mr. F. A. Conkling, whom he would suppose, had lived on a line of salt water, which had during the last year made \$6,000,000 on a capital stock of \$100,000,000, drawn from the public treasury of the nation on account of the bill.

In further advance of the measure, he said the Government was asked only to lend its credit, and the tolls of the Illinois and Michigan Canal were paid more than the interest on the sum expended by taxes on the work.

Mr. A. CONKLING (Rep., N. Y.) explained that the report of the Committee on Naval Affairs, which had been introduced, was made public to increase the influence of the House to improve the naval and military aspects of the work. In the committee room the Committee on Colonization was represented. There was no objection to this bill.

Nevertheless, owing to what had been said against the measure, he proposed to show how, as early as 1776, the question which agitated or connecting the waters of the Gulf of St. Lawrence with those which flow into the Gulf of Mexico, never to afford a great deal of difficulty to connect the two of the nations of large.

Referring to the report of the Committee on Naval Affairs, he said the author of Mr. F. A. Conkling, whom he would suppose, had lived on a line of salt water, which had during the last year made \$6,000,000 on a capital stock of \$100,000,000, drawn from the public treasury of the nation on account of the bill.

In further advance of the measure, he said the Government was asked only to lend its credit, and the tolls of the Illinois and Michigan Canal were paid more than the interest on the sum expended by taxes on the work.

Mr. A. CONKLING (Rep., N. Y.) explained that the report of the Committee on Naval Affairs, which had been introduced, was made public to increase the influence of the House to improve the naval and military aspects of the work. In the committee room the Committee on Colonization was represented. There was no objection to this bill.

Nevertheless, owing to what had been said against the measure, he proposed to show how, as early as 1776, the question which agitated or connecting the waters of the Gulf of St. Lawrence with those which flow into the Gulf of Mexico, never to afford a great deal of difficulty to connect the two of the nations of large.

Referring to the report of the Committee on Naval Affairs, he said the author of Mr. F. A. Conkling, whom he would suppose, had lived on a line of salt water, which had during the last year made \$6,000,000 on a capital stock of \$100,000,000, drawn from the public treasury of the nation on account of the bill.

In further advance of the measure, he said the Government was asked only to lend its credit, and the tolls of the Illinois and Michigan Canal were paid more than the interest on the sum expended by taxes on the work.

Mr. A. CONKLING (Rep., N. Y.) explained that the report of the Committee on Naval Affairs, which had been introduced, was made public to increase the influence of the House to improve the naval and military aspects of the work. In the committee room the Committee on Colonization was represented. There was no objection to this bill.

Nevertheless, owing to what had been said against the measure, he proposed to show how, as early as 1776, the question which agitated or connecting the waters of the Gulf of St. Lawrence with those which flow into the Gulf of Mexico, never to afford a great deal of difficulty to connect the two of the nations of large.

Referring to the report of the Committee on Naval Affairs, he said the author of Mr. F. A. Conkling, whom he would suppose, had lived on a line of salt water, which had during the last year made \$6,000,000 on a capital stock of \$100,000,000, drawn from the public treasury of the nation on account of the bill.

In further advance of the measure, he said the Government was asked only to lend its credit, and the tolls of the Illinois and Michigan Canal were paid more than the interest on the sum expended by taxes on the work.

Mr. A. CONKLING (Rep., N. Y.) explained that the report of the Committee on Naval Affairs, which had been introduced, was made public to increase the influence of the House to improve the naval and military aspects of the work. In the committee room the Committee on Colonization was represented. There was no objection to this bill.

Nevertheless, owing to what had been said against the measure, he proposed to show how, as early as 1776, the question which agitated or connecting the waters of the Gulf of St. Lawrence with those which flow into the Gulf of Mexico, never to afford a great deal of difficulty to connect the two of the nations of large.

Referring to the report of the Committee on Naval Affairs, he said the author of Mr. F. A. Conkling, whom he would suppose, had lived on a line of salt water, which had during the last year made \$6,000,000 on a capital stock of \$100,000,000, drawn from the public treasury of the nation on account of the bill.

In further advance of the measure, he said the Government was asked only to lend its credit, and the tolls of the Illinois and Michigan Canal were paid more than the interest on the sum expended by taxes on the work.

Mr. A. CONKLING (Rep., N. Y.) explained that the report of the Committee on Naval Affairs, which had been introduced, was made public to increase the influence of the House to improve the naval and military aspects of the work. In the committee room the Committee on Colonization was represented. There was no objection to this bill.

Nevertheless, owing to what had been said against the measure, he proposed to show how, as early as 1776, the question which agitated or connecting the waters of the Gulf of St. Lawrence with those which flow into the Gulf of Mexico, never to afford a great deal of difficulty to connect the two of the nations of large.

Referring to the report of the Committee on Naval Affairs, he said the author of Mr. F. A. Conkling, whom he would suppose, had lived on a line of salt water, which had during the last year made \$6,000,000 on a capital stock of \$100,000,000, drawn from the public treasury of the nation on account of the bill.

In further advance of the measure, he said the Government was asked only to lend its credit, and the tolls of the Illinois and Michigan Canal were paid more than the interest on the sum expended by taxes on the work.

Mr. A. CONKLING (Rep., N. Y.) explained that the report of the Committee on Naval Affairs, which had been introduced, was made public to increase the influence of the House to improve the naval and military aspects of the work. In the committee room the Committee on Colonization was represented. There was no objection to this bill.

Nevertheless, owing to what had been said against the measure, he proposed to show how, as early as 1776, the question which agitated or connecting the waters of the Gulf of St. Lawrence with those which flow into the Gulf of Mexico, never to afford a great deal of difficulty to connect the two of the nations of large.

Referring to the report of the Committee on Naval Affairs, he said the author of Mr. F. A. Conkling, whom he would suppose, had lived on a line of salt water, which had during the last year made \$6,000,000 on a capital stock of \$100,000,000, drawn from the public treasury of the nation on account of the bill.

In further advance of the measure, he said the Government was asked only to lend its credit, and the tolls of the Illinois and Michigan Canal were paid more than the interest on the sum expended by taxes on the work.

Mr. A. CONKLING (Rep., N. Y.) explained that the report of the Committee on Naval Affairs, which had been introduced, was made public to increase the influence of the House to improve the naval and military aspects of the work. In the committee room the Committee on Colonization was represented. There was no objection to this bill.

Nevertheless, owing to what had been said against the measure, he proposed to show how, as early as 1776, the question which agitated or connecting the waters of the Gulf of St. Lawrence with those which flow into the Gulf of Mexico, never to afford a great deal of difficulty to connect the two of the nations of large.

Referring to the report of the Committee on Naval Affairs, he said the author of Mr. F. A. Conkling, whom he would suppose, had lived on a line of salt water, which had during the last year made \$6,000,000 on a capital stock of \$100,000,000, drawn from the public treasury of the nation on account of the bill.

In further advance of the measure, he said the Government was asked only to lend its credit, and the tolls of the Illinois and Michigan Canal were paid more than the interest on the sum expended by taxes on the work.

Mr. A. CONKLING (Rep., N. Y.) explained that the report of the Committee on Naval Affairs, which had been introduced, was made public to increase the influence of the House to improve the naval and military aspects of the work. In the committee room the Committee on Colonization was represented. There was no objection to this bill.

Nevertheless, owing to what had been said against the measure, he proposed to show how, as early as 1776, the question which agitated or connecting the waters of the Gulf of St. Lawrence with those which flow into the Gulf of Mexico, never to afford a great deal of difficulty to connect the two of the nations of large.

Referring to the report of the Committee on Naval Affairs, he said the author of Mr. F. A. Conkling, whom he would suppose, had lived on a line of salt water, which had during the last year made \$6,000,000 on a capital stock of \$100,000,000, drawn from the public treasury of the nation on account of the bill.

In further advance of the measure, he said the Government was asked only to lend its credit, and the tolls of the Illinois and Michigan Canal were paid more than the interest on the sum expended by taxes on the work.

Mr. A. CONKLING (Rep., N. Y.) explained that the report of the Committee on Naval Affairs, which had been introduced, was made public to increase the influence of the House to improve the naval and military aspects of the work. In the committee room the Committee on Colonization was represented. There was no objection to this bill.

Nevertheless, owing to what had been said against the measure, he proposed to show how, as early as 1776, the question which agitated or connecting the waters of the Gulf of St. Lawrence with those which flow into the Gulf of Mexico, never to afford a great deal of difficulty to connect the two of the nations of large.

Referring to the report of the Committee on Naval Affairs, he said the author of Mr. F. A. Conkling, whom he would suppose, had lived on a line of salt water, which had during the last year made \$6,000,000 on a capital stock of \$100,000,000, drawn from the public treasury of the nation on account of the bill.

In further advance of the measure, he said the Government was asked only to lend its credit, and the tolls of the Illinois and Michigan Canal were paid more than the interest on the sum expended by taxes on the work.